

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 10 and 12-32 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 5-7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-22 and 25-29 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24 and 30-32 are rejected. This reply makes no amendments, but presents the above claim listing as a courtesy to aid in examination. Upon allowance of a generic claim, it is requested that all withdrawn claims depending from that claim be rejoined. The following remarks are numbered to correspond with the substantive rejections.

3. Claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 30 and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Saito et al. (U.S. Patent 7,150,285; "Saito"), in view of Muraguchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,430,813; "Muraguchi"), and Chang (U.S. Patent 5,321,349; "Chang"). Applicants respectfully traverse this new rejection.

This new rejection indicates continued agreement between Applicants and the Office that Saito does not disclose a charging connector, remote from the contact terminals, for coupling the shaver to a charging power source. To make sure that the new rejection has been clearly understood, the following is given as a summation:

1. Saito discloses a similar electric shaver system to that recited in claim 1, but that doesn't have the additional charging connector;
2. Saito shows a square opening at the end of the shaver that *looks* similar to an electrical connector;
3. Muraguchi shows a shaver with a charging connector at the end (i.e., where Saito's opening appears) - therefore it would have been obvious to replace Saito's square opening with a charging connector; and
4. Chang shows an electrical appliance that can be charged in a cradle through one set of connectors, and that has a separate power input connection for charging when not on the cradle - therefore it would have been obvious to provide a separate charging connector on Saito's shaver.

Regarding the reference to Muraguchi and the suggestion that someone of ordinary skill in this art would be led to add a second charging connector on Saito's shaver because the unidentified square feature at the end of Saito's shaver reminds the Office of other electrical connectors, such inferences are inappropriate in the context of an evaluation under §103. One could equally argue that such a square feature is reminiscent of an indicator, or even a window, for example.

Chang shows a portable DC power supply (that also apparently functions as a flashlight), that is chargeable by being placed on a recharging socket 93 having charging contacts 930. Additionally, the power supply has (shown on the side of the device) an external power input socket 81 that allows an external DC power source to provide power for long term use.

One thing that is missing from all of these cited references or their combination is any suggestion of providing one set of contacts that both provides charging and control signal communication, and another connector, separate from the combined charging/control contacts, for alternately charging the appliance. For this reason alone, the proposed combination of references does not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness against the pending claims.

However, Applicants further note, after a more careful review of the relative dates of their own priority application and those of the cited references, that Saito is not prior art under any paragraph of §102, and that this entire rejection under §103 is therefore improper. Saito was not published or filed in the U.S. prior to Applicants' invention, as evidenced by their German priority patent application filed on April 12, 2003, and so is not prior art under §102(a) or §102(e). Nor was Saito published more than one year before their US filing date of February 13, 2004, so is not prior art under §102(b). The Office is reminded that Saito's JP priority dates are irrelevant to the examination of Applicants' claims. Therefore, in addition to the reasons discussed above, the rejection is improper and should be reconsidered and withdrawn. Consequently, Applicants do not belabor the Examiner with a detailed response to all of the particular technical assertions contained in the rejection, other than to remind the Examiner, should Chang or any other reference from outside the field of the invention be cited in any

further rejection, that such rejection requires a showing of why the reference is "reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved."<sup>1</sup>

4. Claim 31 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over the above combination of Saito with Muraguchi and Chang, in further view of Daniels (U.S. Patent 3,710,224; "Daniels") Daniels is cited as disclosing a shaver with rechargeable batteries that can be re-energized by a power pack that plugs into the shaver or alternatively into a stand which supports the shaver.

However, assuming that the Office is relating Daniels' stand 40 with the cleaning and charging station recited in claim 31, it should be noted that Daniels' wall plug does not "plug into" or provide any electrical connection to the stand itself. Rather, the stand simply retains the L-shaped connector of the power cord in a position where it will plug directly into the input power connector of the shaver when the shaver is placed on the stand. Therefore, there is no sense in which the proposed combination of references would provide the recited invention, "such that the power cable can be selectively used for *powering* the cleaning and charging station and for powering the dry shaving apparatus separate from the cleaning and charging station." At most, the addition of Daniels might raise a consideration of providing a means on the cleaning and charging station to hold a power connector plugged directly into the shaver - but that is not the feature missing from the combination of the other three references.

Additionally, as noted above, any rejection based on Saito is improper and should be withdrawn, as Saito is not properly applied as prior art under any paragraph of §102.

The above remarks are believed to have fully addressed all outstanding rejections. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, in light of the above remarks. Should any issue remain to prevent immediate allowance, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests the courtesy of a telephone call to promptly resolve such issue.

---

<sup>1</sup> In re Deminski, 796 F.2d 436, 230 USPQ 313 (Fed. Cir. 1986).


Applicant : Bichhorn et al.  
Serial No. : 10/552,555  
Filed : May 26, 2006  
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney's Docket No.: 02894-0728US1 / 06609-  
PT2/co

The fee for a 3-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 02894-0728US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 29, 2010

  
James W. Babineau  
Reg. No. 42,276

Customer Number 26161  
Fish & Richardson P.C.  
Telephone: (512) 472-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945

11092535